





UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/893,530	06/29/2001	Craig Weldon	051481-5009	3012
9629 7.	590 03/23/2004		EXAMINER	
MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP			STEVENS, MAURICE E	
• • • • • • • • • • • •	LVANIA AVENUE NW N. DC 20004		ART UNIT PAPER NUMB	
,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	.,		2855	·
		•	DATE MAILED: 03/23/2004	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<u> </u>		•					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
ri R	09/893,530	WELDON, CRAIG					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Maurice Stevens	2855	ph				
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a r - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perion - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stat Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	J. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin eply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from ute, cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication D (35 U.S.C. & 133)	on.				
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15	May 2002.						
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This action is non-final.							
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdened 5) ☐ Claim(s) 8-18 is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	rawn from consideration.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin							
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre	-	• •	٠١				
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the		· ·	a).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicati iority documents have been receive au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage					
Attachment(s)							
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0-Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6. 	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:						

Art Unit: 2855

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 3, line 1 states "The diagnostic apparatus according to claim 3", this claim is rejected because a claim cannot depend on itself, this is an improper dependency.

Claim Objections

Claim 4 is objected to because it is unclear how a pressure gauge that measures a range pressure between one inch of water above ambient pressure and two inches of water below ambient pressure relates to claim 3 and claim 1 from which it depends.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 1-2, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Thompson (5327934).

in regards to claim 1, Thompson discloses a pressure source (an internal combustion engine), a first sitting adapted to be occluded by the removable cap, the first fitting being in fluid communication with the pressure source (fig 1, {where line 18, coming from the gas cap {14} meets the valve 16), a second fitting adapted to sealingly engage the filler, the second fitting being in fluid communication with the pressure

Art Unit: 2855

source and with the first fitting (fig 1, where the line 22, coming from the canister {24} connects with the valve {16}), and orifice being in fluid communication with the pressure source, with the first fitting, and with a second fitting (fig 2 {38}), a first valve controlling the fluid communication with the orifice fig. 1, {16}.

in regards to claim 2, Thompson discloses a diagnostic apparatus according to claim 1, further comprising a pressure gauge in fluid communication with the pressure source (fig1, {32}).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 3-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thompson as applied to claims 1-2 above, and further in view of Cook et al.

In regards to claim 3, Thompson lacks a pressure gauge that measures the range of pressures that exceeds an operational range of the integral pressure management apparatus. However, Cook et al. disclose wherein the pressure gauge measures the range of pressures that exceeds an operational range of the integrated pressure management apparatus (fig 2 + col 1, lines 65-68 and col 2, lines 1-4). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Thompson according to the teachings of Cook et al. for the purpose of using a

Art Unit: 2855

blower as a pressure source to push fuel through the system causing a pressure to better detect if the fuel vapor system contains a leaks or not.

In regards to claim 4, Cook et al. disclose wherein the pressure gauge measures a range of pressures between 1 in. of water above ambient pressure and 2 in. of water below ambient pressure (fig 2).

In regards to claim 5, Cook et al. disclose further comprising a second valve controlling the fluid communication with the second fitting (figure 1, {54 valve 1} and {12 valve 2}).

In regards to claim 6, Cook does not implicitely recite or disclose that in the first fitting comprises a first one of a male member and a female member, the second fitting comprises a second one of the male and female member's, and the male and female member's are sized for mating engagement with respect to one another, however lacking any criticality it would have been obvious to use this pipe to pipe connection/engagement because the valves were connected and this female and male engagement is common and known in the art.

In regards to claim 7, Cook et al. disclose wherein the pressure source comprises one of a manually operated pump and a electromechanical pump (fig. 1, {24 blower} and all vehicle's fuel systems have fuel pumps [electromechanical pump]).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 8-18 are allowed.

Art Unit: 2855

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maurice Stevens whose telephone number is (571) 272-2188. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 6:00am-3:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Lefkowitz can be reached on (571) 272-2180. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MS/2855 3-19-04 EDWARD LEFROWITZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Page 5